



## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

AF  
U600  
#20

Applicant: Edward O. Clapper § Group Art Unit: 2673  
Serial No.: 09/526,780 §  
Filed: March 16, 2000 § Examiner: Nitin Patel  
For: Controlling Wireless Peripherals § Atty. Dkt. No.: ITL.0359P1US  
for Processor-Based Systems § (P7596X)  
Customer No.: 21906 § Confirmation No.: 1757

RECEIVED

MAY 27 2004

Technology Center 2600

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer, Paper No. 19, the following Reply Brief is submitted to address the new points raised by the Examiner.

The Examiner points out the claims do not have the limitation that the wireless interfaces generate different commands. However, the claim does require that only one keyboard be defined on the housing, said keyboard providing different functionalities depending on the orientation of the housing. This is coupled with a pair of wireless interfaces that transmit wireless signals directed at sufficiently spaced angles with respect to one another to enable said receiver to distinguish one of said signals from the other of said signals. Thus, the keyboard provides different functionalities, depending on the orientation of its housing and a pair of wireless interfaces are provided that direct wireless signals at sufficiently spaced angles so that

Date of Deposit: May 20, 2004  
I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to:  
Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Cynthia L. Hayden

they can be distinguished. The net effect of this is that different functionalities can be associated with the spaced wireless interfaces.

The office action concedes that Brusky does not teach one keyboard defined on the housing that provides different functionalities depending on the orientation of the housing. For this, the Bartlett reference is cited, but the Bartlett reference has nothing to do with a wireless keyboard. Thus, there is no teaching of any reason why one would have a keyboard that has different functionalities at different orientations, together with a pair of wireless interfaces that provide distinguishable wireless signals at sufficiently spaced angles.

The final rejection (page 2) asserts that the rationale to combine would be "to allow the teaching of Bartlett's into the device of Brusky's because it would determine a series of position commands that correspond to a series of orientations of the device." But that is exactly the point of the invention, which is nowhere suggested by either reference and in no way suggested by their combination. The Examiner simply concludes obviousness from a combination that simply will not work. To combine a reference that has nothing to do with wireless signals and, according to the Examiner, teaches using different orientations with a reference that shows a wireless transmitter that apparently sends the same signal at spaced angles does not reach the claimed invention. Namely, there is no reason taught in the prior art to combine a keyboard that has different functionalities at different orientations with a pair of wireless transmitters that are spaced apart sufficiently to enable different commands to be recognized at different orientations.

Therefore, the rejection should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 20, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100  
Houston, TX 77024-1805  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]